

STATE OF VERMONT  
Request for Proposal  
Waterbury State Office Complex – Feasibility Study  
Questions/Responses

**Posted: November 22, 2011**

1. Question: The RFP does not appear to include the requirement for cost estimating. Are preliminary cost estimates of the various options to be part of the scope of work? A: Reference Section 2.2 of the RFP which includes the requirement for providing a complete and overall detailed estimate of probable cost. A: The Proposer(s) selected for each Option listed under 2.1.b) Phase II will be required to provide a cost estimate for each Option assigned to them.
2. Question: The RFP requests in Section 2.2 that the selected team develop the design drawings to a 'Schematic Design' level. The term schematic design is used differently by different people, and can represent a spectrum from a highly developed design concept through designs schemes that are fully worked out and ready for design development. Can you please clarify to what level you would like to see these design options developed? The drawings indicated (site plan, floor plans, etc) can be developed to any level along the spectrum. A: The 'SD' documents need to be developed at a level that describes basic concepts that can be understood by a layperson.
3. Question: The State folks assigned to this project will certainly form a key part of the team, and effect how the feasibility study progresses. Can you please provide some detail on what the State representation to the team will look like? A: At the minimum the State team will be a three person team composed of a licensed architect, a licensed mechanical engineer, and the Waterbury DFM (District Facility Manager). Input will also be provided on the Schematic Design Options from Administration, Buildings & General Services, House and Senate Institution Committees, and other parties.
4. Question: How many square feet of the 700,000 mentioned has been damaged and how many square feet of the aforementioned will be included in the scope of work? A: The Public Safety and Forensics buildings are not part of the discussion. All other Ground Floor spaces received water damage (see map of 'High Water Marks' in original RFP document) and must be addressed in some capacity (from flood proofing of some type to recommended selective building removal).
5. Question: The RFI responses were referenced at the walkthrough as available on the State website, but we were unable to find them. Are they available for review? A: Yes, they are on the BGS home page through a link in the lower right hand corner. The link is <http://bgs.vermont.gov/FutureUseWaterbury>
6. Question: Historic photographs were referenced at the walkthrough as available on the State website, but we were unable to find them. Are they available for review? A: The photos are at the end of the original RFP. A separate posting has been added to the BGS page through a link in the lower right hand corner. The link is <http://bgs.vermont.gov/FutureUseWaterbury>

7. Question: Do CADD or BIM drawings exist of the buildings, or should include the production of accurate drawings of the buildings as part of our scope of work? A: No BIM drawings exist. CADD drawings partially existing and generally of only the more recent buildings or renovation projects. Basic CADD drawings exist of the connected building floor plans. The State will revise these drawings to include floor plans of the large stand alone buildings: Ladd Hall, Wasson, Stanley, Ag/Enviro Lab, Recycle/Fleet, and the Power House. PDF drawings generally exist of the post 1950 buildings. Some blueprints also exist of the older buildings. The available drawing information should suffice for the creation of Schematic Design level documents.
8. Question: Please confirm that the State will provide the selected team with the programming parameters required to complete the scope of work. A: The State will provide basic program information for Schematic Design level work to the selected team or teams.
9. Question: Please confirm that the State will provide the selected team with a site, or site parameters, for the analysis of the "new off site building" option. A: The State will do so. The site may be an assumed generic site if a specific site cannot be identified by January.
10. Question: Has a budget been established for the Waterbury Office Complex? A: No. The purpose of the RFP Feasibility Study is to determine the budget parameters.
11. Question: Please describe the status of the Power House, the HVAC systems in the Complex, and what future systems the State is considering. A: The Power House interior flooded to about 5.5' and destroyed the campus generator and the summer boiler. The two large steam boilers and controls have been rebuilt (one is burning #6 oil and the other #2 oil). The wood chip boiler will be re-built in December. Going forward, the Power House will need to be either flood proofed or replaced. Given the proximity to the river, the poor condition of the 1925 masonry building and 1984 wood chip building, and the difficulty of flood proofing the steam tunnel that leads to the Center Core building, it may make best sense to construct a new state of the art Power House. Ground water, solar, propane, oil, and bio-mass or a mix thereof should all be considered. The State is also open to the idea of the co-generation of steam and electricity and also possibly district heating if economically feasible and not excessively complicated to run and manage. Most buildings only have heating systems. Historically the older pre-1915 buildings had gravity air rise masonry chimney ventilation systems connected to roof top cupolas or chimneys. The gravity- systems are currently not functional. The post-1915 buildings have mechanical ventilations systems that may or may not function as follows. Weeks, A Building, Osgood, and the Auditorium had functioning ventilation systems prior to the flood but are now missing the respective air handling units due to the flood remediation, with the rest of the systems being reusable. Forensics lab currently has a functioning and acceptable HVAC system. Ag/Enviro Lab, Dale, Brooks, and Stanley had full HVAC but are currently missing air handling units, with the rest of the systems being reusable. The Center Core's office areas, kitchen and cafeteria were air conditioned but are currently missing air handling units with the rest of the systems being retrievable. Public Safety is currently ventilated satisfactorily with dehumidified air with air conditioning for only for critical functions (radio, computer, EOC, and conference rooms). The entire campus had its computerized HVAC Control system upgraded and enhanced last year. Much of this control system has been repaired post

flood. Selected Proposers will need to provide updated and/or new HVAC systems including heat recovery for all retained buildings. Any proposed new buildings and central plant concepts should be highly energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy whenever possible.

12. Question: Are the Marvin windows going to be standard for future use? A: Yes. Historic Preservation has vetted and approved specific Marvin windows for replacing existing windows in historic buildings at the Waterbury Complex. There are over three thousand windows in the complex. Marvin windows have been installed at: Public Safety, Weeks, Sewing, 6/7 South, 8/9 South, and 10 South. The Recycle/Fleet building has been partially replaced. Any new buildings may use other brands of high efficiency triple glazed windows. Kawneer windows were installed at the 2010 Forensic Laboratory
13. Question: Can you elaborate on the difficulties regarding the drying of the buildings? A: The older buildings have rubble stone, granite, and brick foundations. The newer buildings have concrete foundations. Due to the lack of waterproofing, vapor barriers, and insulation, the foundations remain damp and continually draw moisture into the heated ground floor building areas. The stone and brick foundations and interior walls seem to take the longest to dry due to the porosity of these materials, the many mortar joints, and direct contact of the materials with earth. Soil conditions can generally be described as silty sand with occasional layers of gravel. The Osgood building is constructed on piles.
14. Question: Are Drawings in CAD? A: Only the newer buildings and recent renovation projects are available in CAD. Whatever historic blueprints drawings that existed have been scanned and are available as PDF's. The site utilities plan is available as a CAD drawing as well as the connected building floor plans issued in Addendum No. 1. The State will amend these drawings to include the major stand alone buildings..For any future work that may come out of the RFP process, the existing site conditions will need to be field verified.
15. Question: Does the State plan on demolishing some of the buildings? A: Any demolition depends upon the solution that is ultimately approved by all parties including the Legislature.
16. Question: Are the buildings on the register with Historic Preservation? A: All but: Ag/Enviro Lab (1990), Forensics Lab (2010), and Center Core (1962) and the Sewage Pump Station (date unknown)
17. Question: Is the purpose of the RFP to receive program documents which outline the intent? A: The purpose of the RFP as stated under Section 2 is to solicit proposals from qualified firms or teams to provide a feasibility study of various options, identified in Paragraph (2.1), to determine the best long term solution for housing the approximately 1500 state employees displaced by Tropical Storm Irene.
18. Question: Are the firms expected to put together program documents? A: The selected Proposer(s) will be given enough basic tenant program information to create a schematic design level response. In the future, if a renovation or new construction project results, a formal program study will be conducted.

19. Question: Has the State examined alternative sites for some of the State agencies? A: No, not at this time. If a site cannot be identified by the time the selected Proposer(s) needs to begin work in January, a theoretical site will be provided.
20. Question: What is the next step after the schematic design options are completed? A: The schematic designs will be shared with State Government, the Legislature, the Executive branch, the Advisory Council and the public. Eventually a strategy will emerge and be acted upon by the House and Senate Institutions Committees and the Legislature through the Capital Construction Act process.
21. Question: In reference to Option 2, how much would be non-state? A: The State will provide direction to the selected Proposer that develops Option 2
22. Question: How does this RFP relate to the RFI? A: The RFI was an initial effort to generate interest and ideas regarding the Waterbury State Office Complex.
23. Question: What is driving the time frame of 8 weeks? A: The driver is the upcoming Vermont legislative session that begins the first week of January. Results of the RFP Schematic Design studies are needed within 8 weeks to provide adequate time to present and discuss the possible options with the House and Senate Institutions Committees and other parties.
24. Question: Is the community going to be involved in the selection? A: The selection process will consider the interest and input of the impacted community and/or communities.
25. Question: Can you post the sign-in sheet? A: Yes. See attachment.
26. Question: Are there any air quality problems? A: Conditions throughout the complex are being guided and monitored by an environmental consultant. The flood abatement process is still in process with drying continuing in selected areas. Current damp areas of concern are the four buildings with sub-basement dirt floored areas (6/7 North, 8/9 North, Sewing, & Recycling/Fleet). Any asbestos present in the Ground Floor areas of the Complex at the time of the flood has largely been removed. What few areas of pipe insulation that remain will be removed in the near future. The asbestos plaster in the 'Timeplex Room (old telephone/data entry into the Campus) in the Ground Floor level of 4 North will be abated as soon as Fairpoint Communications removes the last of its freestanding equipment.
27. Question: Did the Ground Floor level contain a rail conveyance system for the transport of food and other goods to the hospital patients? A: No. Food was moved by wheeled carts from the Kitchen via the Ground Floor tunnels and transported vertically by dumb waiters. A few of these dumb waiters still remain but most have been disconnected. In the 1960's and 1970's, most patients ate their meals in the Center Core building patient dining room (presently the open 'West Office' area with the large skylight and the connecting elevated walkways from 10 North and 10 South).
28. Question: Do you prefer fee proposals or hourly rates? A: Please provide pricing as identified under Section 7.5 of the RFP. An updated Price Schedule has been provided. Please complete and submit the updated Price Schedule dated November 22,

2011. In the event one or more contracts are issued as a result of this RFP, individual price options in addition to hourly rates are identified.

29. Question: How many meetings will be conducted during the 8 week period as referenced in Section 3 of RFP? A: At a minimum, four meetings on a bi-weekly basis with additional teleconference meetings as required.
30. Question: Subsequent to completion of the feasibility study described in Option # 2 (Multi-use redevelopment) by the firm or a team selected by the State of Vermont, will this firm or team be prohibited from bidding on or actively participating as a developer or team member in the future redevelopment of any or all of the Waterbury site after the completion of the feasibility study, if the redevelopment option is selected? A: No. The selected team or firm will not be precluded from participating in any subsequent redevelopment or phase of this project insofar as requirements of Administrative Policy #34 – Bidding Integrity are complied with. The link to Administrative Policy #34 is at: <http://bgs.vermont.gov/adminpolicies/policy34> .
31. Question: If multiple firms are selected to evaluate the various redevelopment options, will there be any joint sharing of background information, cost estimation, or backgrounds? A: The State will share the program information and drawings database with the selected Proposer(s). Deliverables and cost estimates will not be shared until the Options are made public.
32. Question: Can one submit a proposal for only one or more (but not all) redevelopment scenarios? For example, can one submit a proposal that addresses the historic adaptive re-use option, but not new construction? A: Yes.
33. Question: Has there been a Phase 1 Environmental Assessment for the site. If not, will there be one by the time the contract is awarded? A: No. The question will be reviewed for feasibility and need.
34. Question: Hazardous materials abatement: to what extent will this be completed by the state, or to what extent is it to be included in and addressed by the selected team(s) feasibility studies? A: The State will address the issue and conduct any required abatement.
35. Question: Will you indicate in greater detail who will comprise the “evaluation committee” as indicated in section 6.4.1? A: To be determined prior to the due date of the proposal.
36. Question: The state has indicated that there is a possibility of hiring multiple teams from this process. Is it also possible that the state could choose to pick and choose individual team members from multiple teams to create a handpicked team of their own choosing? A: This possibility has not been discussed at this time.
37. Question: Are you expecting a soil investigation to be part of this study? If not, what soil information is available to the chosen teams? A: Soil information on the site is limited. Information will be posted to the website from the Forensics Lab project (2010 - large spread footings) and from the Osgood building (1953 – piles).

38. Question: Please identify who will represent the state as an owner's representative in this process? A: To be announced after award of any resulting contract.
39. Question: Are you expecting the chosen team to perform buildings conditions research and provide a summary of these conditions, or will building condition information be gathered by the state? A: In order for the team(s) to prepare intelligent, meaningful design proposals, they will need to familiarize themselves with the conditions of the existing buildings. The State team will assist in the education process.
40. Question: In the required Price Schedule we have been asked to provide an estimate of the total cost for completion of this study, will this number become a not to exceed budget? A: Reference response to Question #30.
41. Question: Could the scope of this study change in relation to further development of the RFI process, and how might this develop? A: We don't anticipate changing the scope of this RFP as a result of the RFI process.
42. Question: Is it expected that any office furniture that was not damaged by the flood be reused by the state office employees, either in the Waterbury State Office Complex or a new building? A: Existing buildings at Waterbury not conducive to open floor plans would re-use existing Waterbury furniture. New buildings, whether at Waterbury or somewhere else, would emphasize use of flexible open office planning concepts and new modular furniture.
43. Question: Is there any limitation of involvement in the RFP process from any firms that participated or that continue to participate in the RFI process? A: Reference response to Question #30. As stated under Section 2.3 of the RFP, firms / teams must identify if they or any members of their team submitted and response to the RFI or worked with a party that submitted a response to the RFI.
44. Question: Will there be any limitation in the future of contractors if they participate in the RFP process by providing cost estimating services? A: Reference response to Question #30.
45. Question: I just called your office seeking to speak with you at your convenience about the RFP and explained that our company would not be responding to the RFP as a proposed vendor, but rather that we were interested in learning about the option; "New Off Site Building". I was advised to send an email prior to today's 4:30 PM deadline. Under the New Off Site Building Option, it is stated that; "Site location(s) to be determined." As a prospective redeveloper/developer, we are interested in learning: will the Off Site Option only explore "New" construction?; or, will redevelopment of existing buildings be considered?; or, will a combination of new construction and redevelopment be considered?; and, how will prospective redevelopment/development proposals be solicited (i.e. through a separate RFP; or, by canvassing a certain geographic area; or by submission of unsolicited proposals)? A: In the near future, the State will explore this issue through direct discussions with property owners and/or the issuance of an RFP for building sites. As to the possibility of the State redeveloping an existing building, the answer depends on location, condition, statutory guidelines and overall project price. The States preference for any off site building is for new constructed, state of the art green building that is highly energy efficient and that could serve as a model for other

| development in the state. For any off site building, a site meeting all statutory guidelines and not located in a flood plain is preferred.

STATE OF VERMONT  
RFP – WATERBURY OFFICE COMPLEX – FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS  
ISSUE DATE: NOVEMBER 10, 2011

FEE STRUCTURE AND PRICE SCHEDULE

UPDATED: November 22, 2011

Page 1 of 1

Based on the respondents understanding of the options identified under Phase II Section 2.1, b) of the RFP and in consideration of the required timeframe for completing the analysis, estimate the total cost associated with requirements of this RFP.

Return and Full Re-use: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Multi-use: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

New Off Site Building (assume 1,200 employees and 250 gsf/person) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Hybrid: Not required at this time

Total Cost: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Additionally, submit the titles, hourly rates, and job descriptions for any and all team members that will be providing services as part of this RFP; include all applicable taxes, fees, overhead, and all other direct or indirect expenses. The attached **Price Schedule** must be completed and submitted as part of the response for the proposal to be considered valid.

FIRM NAMES	Team Member(s)	Hourly Rate
Lead Firm:		\$
		\$
		\$
Sub-Consultant:		\$
		\$
		\$
Sub-Consultant:		\$
		\$
		\$
Sub-Consultant:		\$
		\$
		\$

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Firm: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of Firm: \_\_\_\_\_



STATE OF VERMONT  
Department of Buildings & General Services  
Two Governor Aiken Avenue  
MONTPELIER, VERMONT 05633-5801  
Tel: (802)828-3314 Fax: (802)828-3533

JOB \_\_\_\_\_  
SHEET NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_  
CALCULATED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
SCALE \_\_\_\_\_

MARTY SIENKIEWICZ	SAS ARCHITECTS	863-2227
ASHAR NELSON	VT. INTEGRATED ARCHITECTURE	377-5901
David Slade	Liebert Engineering, Inc	425-5476
JEFF STETTER	GBA	229-1664
Cleary Buckley	Smith Buckley Architects cb@SBAUT.com	399-9451
RICHARD DEANLE	TRUAX COLLINS	658-2775
MIKE BALLARD	FFF	864-6844
STEPHEN MOSMAN	FFI	864-6844
Lisa Howe	Goody Clancy	617-835-3642
PATRICK McLEAN	STANTEC	802-245-4965
Luke Shullenberger	Green Lantern Dev.	802-244-1658
TOM BOLL	DUBOIS & KING tholl@dubois-king.com	802-878-7661
SCOTT KING	HALLAM-ICS "sking@hallam-ics.com"	802 658 4891
John Kiernan	Phelps Engineering jkiernan@phelpseng.com	802 388 7829
Danielle Petter	MacLay Architects	802 496 4004
JOEL Schwartz	Pitkin + Associates jasin@pitkin.com	802-371-7032
Matt Young	D.E.W. Const. myoung@dewcovp.com	802-735-4729
BILL GARDNER	BE-ARCHITECTS bgardner@be-architects.com	655-0145
GREGOR MASEFIELD	STUDIO III ARCHITECTS gregorm@gmail.NET	453-3286
MARJORIE DICKSTEIN	STUDIO III ARCHITECTS marjorie@studio3architecture.net	453-3286

STATE OF VERMONT  
Department of Buildings & General Services  
Two Governor Aiken Avenue  
MONTPELIER, VERMONT 05633-5801  
Tel: (802)828-3314 Fax: (802)828-3533

JOB \_\_\_\_\_  
SHEET NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_  
CALCULATED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

SCALE \_\_\_\_\_

<i>Skip Flanders</i>	<i>W. Lloyd Waterbury</i>	<i>244-5524</i>
Tom O'BRIEN	NORTHERN ARCHITECTS	658-1953
JESSE REMICK	BLACK RIVER DESIGN, ARCH.	223-2044
Rebecca Ellos	Town of Waterbury	839-0515
SHAWN DONOVAN	DuBois & King	802.728.3376
Emily Wadhams	Renaissance Dev.	802 658.9535
Bob Neeld	Engineering Ventures	802-863-6225
John Askew	LN Consulting Inc jaskew@lnconsulting.com	802-655-1053 x104
SCOTT BAKER	SELLERS & Co. ARCHITECTS	802-496-2787
Mac Rood	Bast & Rood Architects	802 482 5200
TONYA FORCIER	SCOTT + PARTNERS, INC	802-879-5153
Bill Maclay	Maclay Arch. Fcfs	802-496-4004
Robert Orr, FNA	Robert Orr & Assoc. LLC	203-777-3387
Jeff Schoellkopf	The Design Group	802.496-5255